

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of October 16, 2007 has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-24 stand rejected. Claims 19-21 have been canceled. Claims 25-40 have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-18 and 22-40 are pending upon entry of the present paper.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 8, 9, 11-13, 16, 18, 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 7,117,374 to Hill et al. (“Hill”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Amended independent claim 1 recites, among other features:

receiving product-related content from [a scanned product] tag, the content including segments of text, at least one of the received segments of text including a meta tag having one or more associated values, each of the associated values corresponding to a different rule;

parsing the received segments of text and identifying the meta tag; [and]

expanding at least one of the received segments of text based on a rule corresponding to a value associated with the identified meta tag...

Hill fails to disclose such features. In particular, Hill fails to describe expanding one part of text received from a scanned tag using a rule corresponding to a value associated with text also received from the same scanned tag. Instead, Hill describes using the scanned data to access an internet web site or to access some other product database. E.g., Hill Abstract. Claim 1 is therefore allowable over Hill.

Amended independent claim 22 recites features similar to those described above with respect to claim 1, and is allowable over Hill for at least reasons substantially similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 2-4, 8, 9, 11-13, 16, 18, and 23, which each depend from at least one of claims 1 and 22, are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Application. No.: 10/686,986
Reply to Office Action of October 16, 2007

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5-7, 10, 14, 15, 17, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hill in view of U.S. patent pub. no. 2004/0153378 to Perkowski (“Perkowski”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Notwithstanding whether the proposed combination of Perkowski and Hill is proper, Perkowski fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Hill with respect to claims 1 and 22. Because claims 5-7, 10, 14, 15, 17 and 24 depend from one of claims 1 or 22, these claims are allowable for the reasons set forth above.

Additional Claims 25-40

New claims 25-40 are directed to a computer-readable medium having instructions executable to perform methods similar to the methods of claims 1-13 and claims 16-18.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and request notice of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 3, 2008

By: /H. Wayne Porter/

H. Wayne Porter
Registration No. 42,084
BANNER & WITCOFF, Ltd.
1100 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Telephone: (202) 824-3000
Facsimile: (202) 824-3001